

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

TAMALPAIS UNION HIGH SCHOOL  
DISTRICT,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
D. W.,  
Defendant.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No.16-cv-04350-HSG

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION TO TEMPORARILY STAY  
ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 12

Before the Court is Plaintiff Tamalpais Union High School District's ("Plaintiff") motion to temporarily enjoin an order issued by non-party California Office of Administrative Hearings ("COAH") in favor of Defendant D.W., a minor, and his parents, Counterclaimants Gregory Wald, D.W.'s guardian ad litem, and Ingrid Sigaretta (together, "Parents") pending judicial review. Dkt. No. 12 ("Mot."). Parents initiated the COAH hearing on behalf of D.W. under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1400, *et seq.* ("IDEA"), and California Education Code §§ 56500, *et seq.*, seeking reimbursement from Plaintiff for D.W.'s private education and related costs. After Parents received a partially favorable ruling, Plaintiff appealed the decision to this Court. Despite the fact that this appeal is now pending, non-party California Department of Education ("CDE") has threatened to withhold state funding from Plaintiff unless it complies with the COAH order. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to stay enforcement pending a merits hearing on a preliminary injunction. The Court ordered Defendant to respond to the motion, and he did so. Dkt. No. 14 ("Opp."). The Court then held a hearing on Plaintiff's request for temporary relief.

For the reasons set forth below, the Court **GRANTS IN PART** and **DENIES IN PART** Plaintiff's motion to temporarily stay enforcement of the COAH's order. The Court does not stay enforcement of the mental health evaluation but temporarily **STAYS** enforcement of the ALJ's

1 award for reimbursement of private tuition and transportation costs for the 2015-16 school year.  
2 The temporary stay shall be in effect until the Court holds a hearing on the parties' anticipated  
3 cross-motions for summary judgment, which shall also serve as a preliminary injunction hearing.  
4 To that end, the Court advances its initial case management conference from November 1, 2016,  
5 to October 11, 2016, at 2:00pm to set an expedited briefing schedule on that motion practice.

6 Plaintiff is **DIRECTED** to serve this order on the COAH and CDE within 24 hours and to  
7 file a status report with the Court within 24 hours of any attempt by the CDE to enforce the COAH  
8 order in any way, including by withholding state funding. If the CDE does attempt to enforce the  
9 COAH order, the Court will take appropriate action to enjoin the CDE's conduct at that time.

10 **I. BACKGROUND**

11 Before turning to the factual and procedural background of this case, the Court sets forth  
12 the basic legal framework of IDEA and applicable California law.

13 **A. Legal Framework of IDEA and California Education Code §§ 56500, et seq.**

14 1. Legislative Purpose of IDEA

15 IDEA was enacted "to ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a  
16 free appropriate public education that emphasizes special education and related services designed  
17 to meet their unique needs," 20 U.S.C. § 1400(d)(1)(A), and "to ensure that the rights of children  
18 with disabilities and parents of such children are protected," *id.* § 1400(d)(1)(B). Before the first  
19 incarnation of the statute was enacted, children with special needs were not receiving appropriate  
20 educational services, were being excluded entirely from schools, were left undiagnosed, and did  
21 not have access to sufficient resources. *Id.* § 1400(c)(2). To those ends, IDEA provides states  
22 with special-education funding that is conditional upon creating rules, regulations, and policies  
23 that conform to the purposes and requirements of the federal statute. *Id.* §§ 1407, 1411-13; *Honig*  
24 v. *Doe*, 484 U.S. 305, 310 (1988). In California, those rules are found in the California Education  
25 Code §§ 56500, *et seq.* and title 5 of the California Code of Regulations §§ 3000, *et seq.* *Porter v.*  
26 *Bd. of Trustees of Manhattan Beach Unified Sch. Dist.*, 307 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (9th Cir. 2002).

27 States receiving funding under IDEA are required to provide all disabled children with a  
28 "free appropriate public education." *See id.* § 1411(d). In large part, this means that every

1 disabled child must receive an appropriate “special education” along with “related services” “at  
2 public expense.” *Id.* § 1401(9). Under IDEA, a “special education” means a “specially designed  
3 instruction” that “meet[s] the unique needs of a child with a disability.” *Id.* § 1401(29). “Related  
4 services” means transportation to and from school and supportive services like speech-language  
5 pathology and social work services. *Id.* § 1401(26)(A). But IDEA does not require that a local  
6 school district “maximize the potential” of a disabled student in a manner “commensurate with the  
7 opportunity provided” to their typically developing peers, only that it “confer some educational  
8 benefit.” *Bd. of Educ. of the Henrick Hudson Central School Dist. v. Rowley*, 458 U.S. 176, 200-  
9 01 (1982); *accord J.L. v. Mercer Island School Dist.*, 592 F.3d 938, 950 (9th Cir. 2010).

10           2.       Individualized Evaluation and Educational Programming

11           To ensure a free appropriate public education, IDEA requires that the local educational  
12 agency “conduct a full and individual initial evaluation” of a student “before the initial provision  
13 of special education and related services.” 20 U.S.C. § 1414(a)(1). This evaluation “determine[s]  
14 whether a child is a child with a disability” within the meaning of IDEA and also “the educational  
15 needs of such child.” *Id.* § 1414(a)(1)(C)(i), (ii). To do so, the local educational agency must “use  
16 a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional, developmental, and  
17 academic information, including information provided by the parent,” “not use any single measure  
18 or assessment as the sole criterion,” and “use technically sound instruments that may assess the  
19 relative contribution of cognitive and behavioral factors, in addition to physical or developmental  
20 factors.” *Id.* § 1414(b)(2). The local educational agency must also ensure, among other things,  
21 that the child is assessed in all areas of suspected disability. *Id.* § 1414(b)(3)(B). After these  
22 assessments are completed, a team of qualified professionals must determine whether the child has  
23 a cognizable disability and, if so, the educational needs of the child. *Id.* § 1414(b)(4).

24           Once an initial evaluation report is issued, the professionals who assessed the student, in  
25 connection with other qualified professionals and the student’s parents, prepare an individualized  
26 educational program (“IEP”) for the student. *Id.* § 1414(c), (d). The IEP is a written statement  
27 that includes: (1) the child’s present levels of academic achievement and functional performance;  
28 (2) a statement of measurable annual goals; (3) a description of how the child’s progress will be

1 measured; (4) a statement of the special education and related services to be provided to the child;  
2 (5) an explanation of the extent to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children;  
3 (6) necessary testing accommodations; (7) the start date for the IEP; and (8) postsecondary school  
4 goals and transition plans for further education or employment. *Id.* § 1414(d). The team that  
5 created the IEP then reviews it periodically and revises it as appropriate. *Id.* § 1414(d)(4).

6       3.     Complaint and Due Process Hearing

7       “When a party objects to the adequacy of the education provided, the construction of the  
8 IEP, or some related matter, IDEA provides procedural recourse: It requires that a State provide  
9 ‘[a]n opportunity for any party to present a complaint . . . with respect to any matter relating to the  
10 identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the child, or the provision of a free  
11 appropriate public education to such child.’” *Winkelman ex. rel. Winkelman v. Parma City School*  
12 *Dist.*, 550 U.S. 516, 525 (2007) (quoting 20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(6)). By presenting a complaint, a  
13 party is able to pursue a process of review that begins with an informal preliminary meeting. 20  
14 U.S.C. § 1415(f)(1)(B)(i)(IV). If the complaint is not resolved “to the satisfaction of the parents  
15 within 30 days,” *id.* § 1415(f)(1)(B)(ii), they may request an “impartial due process hearing” to be  
16 conducted either by the school district or by the state educational agency, *id.* § 1415(f)(1)(A).

17       During a due process hearing, the hearing officer will decide whether the school district  
18 committed a substantive or procedural violation. *Id.* § 1415(f)(3)(E).<sup>1</sup> A substantive violation lies  
19 if a child was denied a free appropriate public education. *Id.* § 1415(f)(3)(E)(i). “In matters  
20 alleging a procedural violation,” the hearing officer “may find that a child did not receive a free  
21 appropriate public education,” only if the procedural violation “(I) impeded the child’s right to a  
22 free appropriate public education; (II) significantly impeded the parents’ opportunity to participate  
23 in the decisionmaking process regarding the provision of a free appropriate public education to the  
24 parents’ child; or (III) caused a deprivation of educational benefits.” *Id.* § 1415(f)(3)(E)(ii). And  
25 IDEA allows a hearing officer (or court) to require the school district “to reimburse the parents for  
26 the cost of [private–school] enrollment if the court or hearing officer finds that the agency had not

27  
28       

---

<sup>1</sup> The state laws enacted in compliance with IDEA, rather than IDEA itself, set forth the rules of  
decision in a due process hearing. *See Porter*, 307 F.3d at 1068-69.

1 made a free appropriate public education available to the child.” *Id.* § 1412(a)(10)(C)(ii).

2 If the school district, rather than the state educational agency, conducts the due process  
3 hearing, then “any party aggrieved by the findings and decision rendered in such a hearing may  
4 appeal such findings and decision to the State educational agency.” *Id.* § 1415(g)(1). Once the  
5 state agency has reached its decision, an aggrieved party may file suit in federal court: “Any party  
6 aggrieved by the findings and decision made [by the hearing officer] shall have the right to bring a  
7 civil action with respect to the complaint.” *Id.* § 1415(i)(2)(A); *see also* § 1415(i)(1).

8 **B. Factual Background**

9 The Court now turns to the facts of this case, which are taken from the underlying COAH  
10 administrative decision, Dkt. No. 12-2 (“AD”), and the other materials filed by the parties.

11 D.W. is a 16-year old male who resides in Plaintiff’s school district with his Parents. *Id.* ¶  
12 1. When D.W. was three years old, he was found eligible to receive and began receiving special  
13 education under the speech or language impairment category. *Id.* ¶ 2. In the fifth grade, he was  
14 diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and was found eligible for special education  
15 on that basis as well. *Id.* Before high school, D.W. had never attended a public school and had  
16 been enrolled at a private school for students with mild to moderate learning differences and social  
17 communication disorders. *Id.* ¶ 3.

18 D.W. transferred into Plaintiff’s school district to begin high school in the fall of 2014. *Id.*  
19 ¶ 4. To prepare for the transition, in April 2014, Plaintiff proposed to assess D.W. in the areas of  
20 academic achievement, cognitive development/learning ability, and speech and language in order  
21 to develop an IEP for him. *Id.* His mother consented. *Id.* D.W.’s speech-language assessment,  
22 conducted by a speech-language pathologist, showed that he exhibited special needs in language  
23 comprehension and social pragmatics. *Id.* ¶ 5. As a result, D.W. needed frequent check-ins from  
24 his teachers as well as targeted language therapy. *Id.* His academic and psychoeducational  
25 assessment, conducted by a school psychologist in June 2014, showed average or above average  
26 performance in most academic areas and average cognitive abilities, but also reflected that D.W.  
27 struggled with defiance/aggression, hyperactivity, learning, executive function, inattention, and  
28 social relations. *Id.* ¶¶ 6-11. This confirmed D.W.’s need for multiple classroom accommodations

1 and potentially coaching and support around emotional and behavioral management. *Id.* ¶ 12. In  
2 sum, D.W. remained eligible for special education. *Id.*

3 Following these assessments, in June 2014, Plaintiff convened an IEP team meeting with  
4 the Parents. *Id.* ¶ 13. Under the proposed IEP, Plaintiff offered to place D.W. in a general  
5 education program at a public high school within the district, but with resource specialist support  
6 for one period each day, individual and group speech and language therapy for 45 minutes each  
7 week, and various classroom and out-of-classroom accommodations. *Id.* ¶ 14.

8 After D.W.'s mother visited and observed a social skills class, Parents decided to place  
9 D.W. in a new private high school and requested reimbursement on the basis that the proposed  
10 IEP did not provide a free appropriate public education, as required by IDEA and the California  
11 Education Code. *Id.* ¶ 20. On August 11, 2014, Plaintiff denied the funding request. *Id.* D.W.  
12 attended the new school for the fall of 2014, but ultimately transferred back to his previous private  
13 school for the remainder of the school year. *Id.* ¶ 21. Parents notified Plaintiff about this new  
14 placement and again requested reimbursement, and Plaintiff again denied the request. *Id.*

15 On March 13, 2015, in anticipation of the annual IEP meeting, Plaintiff requested that  
16 Parents allow it to reassess D.W.'s needs. *Id.* ¶ 22. His father consented. *Id.* The assessment was  
17 completed on May 21, 2015, and it concluded that D.W. had made progress on the academic and  
18 psychoeducational goals set during his previous assessment, but his maladaptive behaviors had not  
19 disappeared. *Id.* ¶¶ 23-25. D.W. had also made progress on his speech and language goals, but  
20 continued to struggle with social pragmatics. *Id.* ¶ 26. Following these assessments, on May 21,  
21 2015, Plaintiff convened an IEP team. *Id.* ¶ 27. The 2015 IEP set the same goals as the 2014 IEP,  
22 but added several new goals for transitioning and social pragmatics. *Id.* ¶ 35. D.W.'s special  
23 accommodations remained the same. *Id.* Based on these findings, the 2015 IEP offered to place  
24 D.W. in a public high school with special education day classes for certain subjects, general  
25 education classes for others, and individual and group speech and language services. *Id.* ¶¶ 36-37.

26 After the IEP meeting, D.W.'s mother again visited and observed the special day class that  
27 the IEP offered. *Id.* ¶ 49. On June 17, 2015, Parents refused the 2015 IEP offer and requested  
28 funding to place D.W. in the private school he attended before high school. *Id.* Plaintiff denied

1 the request. *Id.* D.W. now attends a public school within Plaintiff's school district. Opp. at 6.

2 **C. Procedural History**

3 **1. Administrative Due Process Hearing**

4 On April 18, 2016, Parents initiated a due process hearing before the COAH alleging that  
5 Plaintiff had denied D.W. a free appropriate public education for the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school  
6 years, in violation of the IDEA and California Education Code. *Id.* ¶¶ 24-27. Specifically, with  
7 respect to both the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years, Parents alleged that Plaintiff had failed to  
8 offer D.W. classes with a small enough student-to-teacher ratio and failed to offer any counseling  
9 services. *Id.* ¶¶ 15-16, 38, 42. With respect to the 2015-16 school year, Parents also alleged that  
10 Plaintiff had failed to offer mental health and sensory integration evaluations before creating the  
11 2015 IEP, *id.* ¶¶ 28, 34, that Plaintiff's speech and language therapy offer was unclear as to  
12 whether and how often services would be provided in a group versus individual setting, *id.* ¶ 45,  
13 and that Plaintiff did not offer sufficient speech and language services regardless, *id.* ¶ 48.

14 On July 8, 2016, after a three-day evidentiary hearing, an administrative law judge with the  
15 COAH, the Hon. Lisa Lunsford ("ALJ"), found that Plaintiff did not deny D.W. a free appropriate  
16 public education for 2014-15 or 2015-16 by failing to offer sufficient special education services.<sup>2</sup>  
17 *Id.* ¶ 28. But the ALJ found that Plaintiff failed to offer D.W. a free appropriate public education  
18 for the 2015-16 school year by failing to provide a mental health assessment or a sufficiently clear  
19 IEP offer for speech and language therapy. *Id.* ¶¶ 28-30. As a remedy, the ALJ ordered Plaintiff  
20 to reimburse Parents for D.W.'s 2015-16 private school tuition and transportation costs as well as  
21 pay for an independent mental health evaluation. *Id.* ¶¶ 29-30.

22 **2. Federal Appeal and CDE Corrective Action**

23 Plaintiff filed this appeal against D.W. on August 2, 2016, seeking reversal of the ALJ's  
24 order awarding reimbursement and a mental health evaluation. D.W. filed an answer and Parents  
25 counterclaimed against Plaintiff for the 2014-15 tuition and transportation expenses. Dkt. No. 8.<sup>3</sup>

27

---

<sup>2</sup> The ALJ did not reach the question of whether Plaintiff's IEP for speech and language therapy  
28 was sufficient because she found an *a priori* procedural violation, as discussed below. *Id.* ¶ 36.

<sup>3</sup> After appearing in the action, D.W.'s father also petitioned for appointment as D.W.'s guardian  
ad litem, Dkt. No. 10, and the Court granted the petition, Dkt. No. 11.

1       On August 5, 2016, counsel for D.W. and his Parents requested that Plaintiff's counsel  
2 contact their chosen assessor to begin the process of conducting the ALJ's ordered independent  
3 mental health review of D.W. Dkt. No. 12-2 ¶ 2. Plaintiff's counsel responded that his client  
4 would not be funding the assessment because it contended that an ALJ's order under IDEA and  
5 the California Education Code is unenforceable pending an appeal to a federal district court. *Id.*

6       On August 22, 2016, D.W. and Parents filed a compliance complaint with the CDE, which  
7 asserted that Plaintiff was improperly refusing to comply with the COAH order. *Id.* ¶ 3 & Ex. B.  
8 On August 24, 2016, Plaintiff received a corrective action notice from the CDE. Dkt. No. 12-3 ¶ 3  
9 & Ex. A. The notice directed Plaintiff to provide the CDE with proof that it complied with the  
10 ALJ's order by certain deadlines. Specifically, the CDE directed Plaintiff to prove to it that: (1)  
11 Plaintiff sent its criteria for obtaining an independent educational evaluation to Parents, offered to  
12 Parents an independent mental health evaluation for D.W., offered a list of potential assessors for  
13 D.W., and received Parents' selected assessor by September 1, 2016; (2) Plaintiff entered into a  
14 contract with Parents' selected assessor by September 30, 2016; (3) Plaintiff gave a memorandum  
15 to D.W.'s individualized education program team clarifying its past offer for speech and language  
16 services by September 30, 2016; and (4) Plaintiff reimbursed Parents for D.W.'s 2015-16 tuition  
17 and transportation expenses by September 1, 2016. *Id.*

18       After receiving this notice, Plaintiff's counsel spoke with an individual from the Focused  
19 Monitoring and Technical Assistance Unit of the CDE, who informed him that CDE's current  
20 policy is to enforce COAH orders regardless of whether they are being appealed. *Id.* ¶ 5.  
21 Plaintiff's counsel then spoke with the administrator of that CDE unit, who informed him that the  
22 CDE would not change its position about the enforceability of orders on appeal. *Id.* ¶ 6. That  
23 administrator also informed Plaintiff's counsel that if Plaintiff did not comply with the corrective  
24 action notice, the CDE would notify Plaintiff that it was out of compliance and could be subject to  
25 sanctions, up to and including the loss of state funding for the school district. *Id.*

26           3.       Plaintiff's Motion for a Stay of Enforcement Pending Appeal

27       On September 8, 2016, Plaintiff filed the instant motion for a temporary restraining order  
28

1 and for an order to show cause why a preliminary injunction should not issue.<sup>4</sup> Plaintiff contends  
2 the Ninth Circuit has held that the IDEA automatically stays enforcement of an underlying agency  
3 order pending appeal. Mot. at 7-8; *see also* 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(1)(A); *Porter*, 307 F.3d at 1071.  
4 The only exception to this rule, according to Plaintiff, is that a student may remain in his current  
5 educational placement pending an appeal, unless his parents and the state agree otherwise. Mot. at  
6 8; *see also* 20 U.S.C. § 1415(j). But Plaintiff argues that this “stay put” provision does not apply  
7 because D.W.’s current educational placement is not at issue. Furthermore, even if the COAH  
8 order was not automatically stayed pending appeal, Plaintiff asserts that a stay of the COAH order  
9 is necessary because it has been given a Hobson’s choice: either it can comply with the order and  
10 moot its appeal in favor of some kind of recoupment action, or not comply and potentially lose its  
11 state funding as the CDE has threatened. To that effect, Plaintiff also argues that it is likely to  
12 prevail on this appeal and that the balance of hardships and public interest weighs in its favor.

13 The Court ordered D.W. and his Parents to respond to Plaintiff’s motion on September 9,  
14 2016. Dkt. No. 13. They did so, arguing that California has a duty to implement administrative  
15 orders under the IDEA and California law, making them enforceable pending appeal. Opp. at 4-5.  
16 They also argue that there is no risk of irreparable injury because the Court can order recoupment  
17 from the Parents if they are unsuccessful in defending the COAH decision. *Id.* at 3. Furthermore,  
18 they argue that there is no likelihood that Plaintiff will prevail on the merits. *Id.* at 5-6.

19 The Court held a hearing on Plaintiff’s motion on September 19, 2016. *See* Dkt. No. 15.

## 20 II. LEGAL STANDARD

21 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65 governs temporary restraining orders and preliminary  
22 injunctions. A preliminary injunction enjoins conduct pending a trial on the merits. *See* Fed. R.  
23 Civ. P. 65(a). A temporary restraining order enjoins conduct pending a hearing on a preliminary  
24 injunction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b). Where notice of a motion for a temporary restraining order  
25 is given, the same legal standard applies as a motion for a preliminary injunction. *See Stuhlbarg*  
26 *Int’l Sales Co. v. John D. Brush & Co.*, 240 F.3d 832, 839 n. 7 (9th Cir. 2001).

27  
28 <sup>4</sup> Plaintiff styled its motion as “ex parte,” but notice was given to Defendant and Counterclaimants through ECF. It does appear that the motion was ex parte with respect to the CDE and COAH.

1 A plaintiff seeking preliminary relief “must establish that he is likely to succeed on the  
2 merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the  
3 balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.” *Winter v. Nat.*  
4 *Resources Defense Council*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). Preliminary relief is “an extraordinary remedy  
5 that may only be awarded upon a clear showing that the plaintiff is entitled to such relief.” *Id.* at  
6 22. A court must find that “a certain threshold showing is made on each factor.” *Leiva-Perez v.*  
7 *Holder*, 640 F.3d 962, 966 (9th Cir. 2011). Provided that the movant has made this showing, in  
8 balancing the four factors, “serious questions going to the merits and a balance of hardships that  
9 tips sharply towards the plaintiff can support issuance of a preliminary injunction, so long as the  
10 plaintiff also shows that there is a likelihood of irreparable injury and that the injunction is in the  
11 public interest.” *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1135 (9th Cir. 2011).

### 12 III. DISCUSSION

13 Plaintiff requests that the Court temporarily enjoin enforcement of the ALJ’s order. The  
14 Court first turns to Plaintiff’s threshold argument that the orders of administrative law judges from  
15 due process hearings are automatically stayed once an aggrieved party files a civil action in a  
16 district court. Finding that the statutory text, legislative history, and precedent do not support that  
17 interpretation, the Court proceeds to conduct a traditional preliminary relief analysis. The Court  
18 concludes that the ALJ’s order should be stayed only in part pending summary judgment.

#### 19 A. Enforceability of Due Process Hearing Orders Pending Appeal

20 The Court first addresses Plaintiff’s contention that orders from due process hearings held  
21 under IDEA and applicable California law are automatically stayed when an aggrieved party files  
22 an appeal. If that were true, then the Court would not need to undertake a traditional stay analysis.

23 Plaintiff relies primarily on 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2), which describes the administrative  
24 procedures that control appeals from hearing decisions. The statute provides that: “A decision  
25 made in a hearing conducted pursuant to subsection (f) or (k) shall be final, except that any party  
26 involved in such hearing may appeal such decision under the provisions of subsection (g) and  
27 paragraph (2).” *Id.* § 1415(i)(1)(A). Subsections (f) and (k) refer to the rules governing due  
28 process hearings and hearings on the removal of a student from a school for violating school rules.

1 20 U.S.C. §§ 1415(f), (k). Subsection (g) governs situations where the initial due process hearing  
2 was held before a school district and provides that an aggrieved party has the right to appeal that  
3 decision to a state educational agency, *id.* § 1415(g)(1), (g)(2); paragraph (2) provides that a party  
4 aggrieved by the findings and decision made under subsections (f) and (k) has the right to bring a  
5 civil action in a state court of competent jurisdiction or a federal district court, *id.* § 1415(i)(2)(A).  
6 Reading these provisions together, IDEA provides that: (1) the decision of a local educational  
7 agency “shall be final, except that” any party may appeal that decision to a state agency; (2) the  
8 decision of a state agency “shall be final, except that” any party may bring a civil action in state or  
9 federal court appealing that decision. *See id.* § 1415(f), (g), (i), (k). Plaintiff’s argument is that  
10 the word “except” means when an appeal has been filed to a district court, as here, the underlying  
11 decision by a state agency is automatically not “final” and therefore unenforceable.

12 Although the Court was initially inclined to agree with Plaintiff, a thorough review of the  
13 statutory scheme, legislative history, regulations, and precedent compel it to conclude otherwise.  
14 The starting point is the statutory text. *Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster, Inc.*, 569 F.3d 946, 951  
15 (9th Cir. 2009) (“The preeminent canon of statutory interpretation requires us to presume that [the]  
16 legislature says in a statute what it means and means in a statute what it says there. Thus, our  
17 inquiry begins with the statutory text, and ends there as well if the text is unambiguous.”). The  
18 text at issue states that “a decision made [in a state educational agency] shall be final, except that  
19 any party may bring an action [in federal court if aggrieved].” 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(1)(B). This  
20 provision is somewhat ambiguous as to whether an order is final and enforceable pending appeal  
21 to a district court. On the one hand, it could be read to mean that an order is final *unless* it is  
22 appealed and therefore unenforceable pending appeal; on the other hand, it could be read to mean  
23 that an order is final, *subject to* an appeal of that final order. Because the Court concludes that the  
24 provision is ambiguous as to this issue, it looks to legislative history, recognizing that it may be  
25 “murky.” *See Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Allapattah Servs., Inc.*, 545 U.S. 546, 568 (2005). The only  
26 relevant material comes from a Senate Report from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,  
27 which interprets the exact statutory language at issue. It states that “decisions rendered as a result  
28 of the due process proceedings . . . shall be final and binding *subject only to* appropriate

1 administrative or judicial review.” S. REP. 94-168, 47, 1975 U.S.C.C.A.N. 1425, 1470 (emphasis  
2 added). This material supports an interpretation of the statute as meaning that final orders remain  
3 final on appeal, but are subject to modification or reversal upon a decision of the appellate court.

4 This interpretation is further confirmed by the federal regulation interpreting the provision.  
5 34 C.F.R. § 300.152(c)(2) sets out the minimum complaint procedures that states must enact in  
6 order to be in compliance with IDEA. As relevant here, the regulation provides that if a state  
7 educational agency receives a complaint, but the complaint contains an issue that “has previously  
8 been decided in a due process hearing involving the same parties . . . [t]he due process hearing  
9 decision is *binding* on that issue [and] the [state educational agency] must inform the complainant  
10 to that effect.” *Id.* (emphasis added). That a due process hearing decision is “binding” under the  
11 federal regulation, and not merely final, suggests that a decision by a state educational agency is  
12 enforceable when rendered. Similarly, the California Education Code, which is the controlling  
13 law here unless out of compliance with IDEA, provides that a due process hearing before a state  
14 educational agency “shall be the final administrative determination and *binding* on all parties.”  
15 Cal. Educ. Code § 56505 (emphasis added). Taken together, the federal and state agencies appear  
16 to agree that the final decisions of state educational agencies are final and binding.

17 The Court also finds support for that interpretation of § 1415(i) in precedent. Although the  
18 Court could not locate any opinions from courts in this circuit that directly address the issue, the  
19 District Court for the District of Columbia has rejected Plaintiff’s position. In *D.C. v. Masucci*, 13  
20 F. Supp. 3d 33, 38 (D.D.C. 2014), the plaintiff school district appealed the decision of a state  
21 educational agency and took the position that “implementation of the [hearing officer’s decision]  
22 is automatically stayed during the pendency of the appeal.” The court disagreed, stating that  
23 “[t]he decision of a hearing officer is deemed ‘final’ *unless and until it is vacated or modified by* .  
24 . . the appropriate federal court.” *Id.* at 42 (emphasis added). In addition, the cases from this  
25 district that the court has found did not discuss or apparently even consider the possibility that a  
26 final order of a state educational agency is not final, binding, and immediately enforceable barring  
27 a showing that preliminary injunctive relief is warranted. *See, e.g., San Francisco Unified School*  
28 *Dist. v. S.W.*, No. C-10-05211, 2011 577413 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 9, 2011) (denying the plaintiff’s

1 motion to stay pending appeal); *Ravenswood City School Dist. v. J.S.*, No. C 10-03950, 2010 WL  
2 4807061 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2010) (denying plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction).

3 Furthermore, if Congress meant to provide that underlying administrative decisions are  
4 automatically stayed and unenforceable pending appeal, it could say so expressly. For example,  
5 Congress did include an automatic stay provision in the procedural safeguards section of IDEA,  
6 but that section does not facially apply to appeals of administrative decisions. Known as the "stay  
7 put" provision, 20 U.S.C. § 1415(j) provides that "during the pendency of any proceedings  
8 conducted pursuant to this section, unless the State or local educational agency agree otherwise,  
9 the child shall remain in the then-current educational placement of the child . . . until all such  
10 proceedings have been completed." This stay provision functions as an "automatic preliminary  
11 injunction, meaning that the moving party need not show the traditionally required factors (e.g.,  
12 irreparable harm) in order to obtain preliminary relief." *Joshua A. v. Rocklin Unified School Dist.*,  
13 559 F.3d 1036, 1037 (9th Cir. 2009). There is no similar automatic stay provision that applies to  
14 final orders of state educational agencies.<sup>5</sup>

15 In sum, and in consideration of the above, the Court holds that 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2) does  
16 not provide that all decisions of state educational agencies are automatically stayed pending appeal  
17 to a district court or other court of competent jurisdiction. Instead, a plaintiff must file a motion to  
18 stay enforcement (e.g., for a preliminary injunction) of the underlying order pending review.

19 Plaintiff's citation to *Porter v. Board of Trustees of Manhattan Beach Unified School*  
20 *District*, 307 F.3d 1064 (9th Cir. 2002), does not change this conclusion. In that case, the parents  
21 of a disabled child initiated a due process hearing before a state educational agency, the California  
22 Special Education Hearing Office, which rendered a decision in their favor. *Id.* at 1067-68. Over  
23 the course of the school year, the parents argued that the school district had not fully implemented  
24 the education program required by the due process hearing decision. *Id.* at 1068. In response,  
25 they filed a civil suit against the school district in a federal district court for noncompliance. *Id.*  
26 The district court dismissed the action for failure to failing to exhaust administrative remedies by

---

27  
28<sup>5</sup> The Court rejects Defendant's claim at the TRO hearing that the stay put provision applies in this  
case. No one is challenging D.W.'s current placement, which is not at issue in any way.

1 first filing an appeal with the state educational agency. *Id.* The Ninth Circuit reversed, finding  
2 that there was no need for the parents to file another appeal to the state agency before filing an  
3 action in the district court because neither party had “appealed [the due process hearing] order to a  
4 court of competent jurisdiction” and therefore “the order was final and binding under the IDEA  
5 and state law.” *Id.* at 1069; *see also id.* at 1071 (“Once a due process hearing issues an order that  
6 is not appealed by either party, the IDEA requires that the order be treated as ‘final.’”). Because  
7 the order was final and because a state educational agency does not have jurisdiction to enforce its  
8 own final due process hearing orders, it would have been “futile or inadequate” for the parents to  
9 file a complaint in the state agency, permitting an original action in the district court. *Id.* (citing  
10 *Wyner ex rel. Wyner v. Manhattan Beach Unified School Dist.*, 223 F.3d 1026, 1030 (9th Cir.  
11 2000)).

12 Plaintiff contends that *Porter*, by negative implication, must mean that if an ALJ’s order in  
13 an IDEA proceeding is appealed, then it is not final, and thus not unenforceable.<sup>6</sup> But the Court  
14 cannot make this leap from the discussion in *Porter*. A finding that an order is final if *not*  
15 appealed does not establish that an order that *is* appealed is *not* final. Accordingly, absent clear  
16 controlling authority to the contrary, the Court agrees with the court’s approach in *Masucci* and  
17 concludes that an appeal does not automatically render an ALJ’s decision unenforceable.

#### 18       B.     Motion to Temporarily Stay Administrative Order

19       The Court now turns to Plaintiff’s argument that the Court should stay enforcement of the  
20 COAH order pending review under the traditional four-part preliminary relief analysis. Applying  
21 the *Winter* test for temporary relief, the Court concludes that Plaintiff’s motion will be granted in  
22 part and denied in part as set forth below.

##### 23           1.     Likelihood of Success on the Merits

24       A plaintiff seeking temporary relief must first establish that “he is likely to succeed on the  
25 merits.” *Winter*, 555 U.S. at 20. Plaintiff makes three arguments on appeal: (1) it was inherently  
26 contradictory and therefore legally erroneous for the ALJ to conclude that Plaintiff needed to

---

27  
28       <sup>6</sup> At the TRO hearing, Plaintiff’s counsel acknowledged that no case has adopted this interpretation of *Porter*.

1 assess D.W.’s mental health during its 2015 reevaluation when the ALJ also found that D.W. had  
2 not met his burden of showing he had any mental health needs during the 2014 evaluation; (2) the  
3 ALJ’s finding that Plaintiff’s 2015 IEP denied D.W. a free appropriate public education because it  
4 indicated that he would receive both group and individual language services during a single block  
5 of time is erroneous; and (3) even if Plaintiff’s 2015 IEP did deny D.W. a free appropriate public  
6 education, it was inequitable for the ALJ to award Parents complete tuition reimbursement. Mot.  
7 at 9-10. Because each of these arguments is a discrete issue, the Court will consider each in turn.

8                   a)         *Failure to Provide 2015 Mental Health Assessment*

9                  The ALJ concluded that Plaintiff committed a procedural violation of the IDEA because it  
10 failed to assess D.W. for mental health issues during his 2015 evaluation despite being placed on  
11 notice of a potential disability by his 2014 evaluation. AD ¶ 19. Specifically, the ALJ found that  
12 Plaintiff was put on notice in 2014 that D.W. had symptoms of anxiety and aggression that could  
13 be rooted in a social-emotional or mental health condition. *Id.* ¶ 16. The ALJ further concluded  
14 that this procedural violation constituted a denial of a free appropriate public education for 2015-  
15 16 because it “significantly impeded Parents’ opportunity to participate in the decisionmaking  
16 process regarding the provision of a [free appropriate public education] to [D.W.]” by making it  
17 “impossible for Parents to know whether [Plaintiff’s] May 2015 IEP offer recommended the  
18 appropriate goals, accommodations and services to address [D.W.’s] unique needs[.]” *Id.* ¶ 20.

19                  A school district has a duty during an individual evaluation to assess a student in “all areas  
20 of suspected disability.” *Timothy O. v. Paso Robles Unified School Dist.*, 822 F.3d 1105, 1119  
21 (9th Cir. 2016) (quoting 20 U.S.C. §§ 1414(a)(1)(A), (b)(3)(B)). California Education Code §  
22 56320(f) also requires that the child be assessed “in all areas related to the suspected disability.”  
23 A disability is “suspected” when “the district has notice that the child has displayed symptoms of  
24 that disability.” *Timothy O.*, 822 F.3d at 1119. “A school district cannot disregard a non-frivolous  
25 suspicion of which it becomes aware simply because of the subjective views of its staff, nor can it  
26 dispel this suspicion through informal observation.” *Id.* at 1121. That said, a procedural violation  
27 of IDEA is not actionable unless it constitutes a denial of a free appropriate public education. 20  
28 U.S.C. § 1415(f)(3)(E)(ii). That occurs only if the procedural violation: “(I) impeded the child’s

1 right to a free appropriate public education; (II) significantly impeded the parents' opportunity to  
2 participate in the decisionmaking process regarding the provision of a free appropriate public  
3 education to the parents' child; or (III) caused a deprivation of educational benefits." *Id.*

4 The Court cannot find on the record before it that the ALJ likely erred in finding, relying  
5 on *Timothy O.*, that Plaintiff had a duty to evaluate D.W. for mental health issues during his 2015  
6 evaluation. While the ALJ found D.W. did not establish that Plaintiff should have offered  
7 counseling as a related service in his 2014 IEP, because D.W. did not meet his burden of showing  
8 that his "negative peer interactions," "aggressive behaviors," and "severe episode of hair pulling"  
9 "were rooted in a social-emotional need requiring counseling," AD ¶ 16, that same evidence  
10 probably put Plaintiff on notice that it should have conducted a mental health evaluation the  
11 following year. As the ALJ noted in her decision, "[t]his conclusion does not conflict with the  
12 earlier determination that [D.W.] did not establish a need for counseling as a related service. The  
13 two conclusions are based on different legal standards, and while the evidence showed that mental  
14 health was an area of suspected disability, [D.W.] did not establish that he required counseling as a  
15 related service in his June 2014 IEP in order to receive educational benefit." *Id.* ¶ 21. The Court  
16 also cannot find on the record before it that the ALJ likely erred in finding that this probable  
17 procedural violation did not constitute a denial of a free appropriate public education to D.W. The  
18 Ninth Circuit made clear in *Timothy O.* that the failure to assess a student for a suspected disability  
19 is a "fundamental procedural violation[]" that makes it "impossible for the IEP Team to consider  
20 and recommend appropriate services necessary to address [a student's] unique needs." 822 F.3d at  
21 1119.

22 Accordingly, the Court finds that Plaintiff has not met its burden of showing a likelihood  
23 of prevailing on the merits on this issue, obviating the need to consider the remaining *Winter*  
24 factors. The Court appreciates that this decision may make the ALJ's order on the mental health  
25 evaluation effectively unreviewable because it may not be possible for Plaintiff to seek  
26 reimbursement from Parents in the event that it ultimately prevails on this appeal. But a complete  
27 risk of irreparable harm does not negate the necessity of showing of a likelihood of prevailing on  
28 the merits. *See Leiva-Perez*, 640 F.3d at 966 (threshold showing is necessary for each element of

the *Winter* test).

b) Unclear 2015 IEP Regarding Speech and Language Therapy

The ALJ also concluded that Plaintiff's 2015 IEP offer was so unclear as to the provision of individual and group speech and language therapy that it denied D.W. a free appropriate public education. AD ¶¶ 32-33. Specifically, the ALJ found that:

On the IEP, the boxes are checked for both individual and group services and there is no further information to describe how the 45 minutes per week would be allotted to each. The IEP's only description of the services is a "combination of individual and group." Such language is too vague to permit Parents to understand the nature, frequency and duration of the services. Although Tamalpais explained to Parents that the offer included a weekly 45 minute pragmatic social skills group, the IEP does not reflect that the 45 minutes per week is spent solely in a group, nor does it reference or describe the specific group.

*Id.* ¶ 32. The ALJ found that this procedural violation constituted a denial of a free appropriate public education because it “significantly impeded Parents’ opportunity to participate in the IEP process” because “the evidence does not establish that parents clearly understood it.” *Id.* ¶ 33.

Alternatively, the ALJ also found that the 2015 IEP impeded D.W.'s rights:

The offer left it to [the therapist's] discretion as to whether and how to apportion [D.W.'s] speech and language services between group and individual therapy, yet there was no agreement, nor could there be a guarantee, that she would be [D.W.'s] service provider throughout the year. Understanding the offer and implementation of the services could therefore change with each service provider, ranging from up to 45 minutes per week of individual services to none at all.

*Id.* ¶ 35. Based on these findings, the ALJ awarded Parents complete reimbursement of the private school tuition they paid in 2015-16, as well as transportation costs. *Id.* Remedies, ¶¶ 10-12.

The Ninth Circuit has made clear that a written IEP is a “formal requirement [that] has an important purpose that is not merely technical . . . it should be enforced rigorously . . . [because] a formal, written offer creates a clear record that will do much to eliminate troublesome factual disputes many years later about when placements were offered, what placements were offered, and what additional educational assistance was offered to supplement a placement, if any.” *Union School Dist. v. Smith*, 15 F.3d 1519, 1523, 1526 (9th Cir. 1994) (holding that a school district’s

failure to provide any written IEP was a procedural violation of IDEA). IDEA itself provides that an IEP include a statement of the special education and related services that will be provided to the student. 20 U.S.C. § 1414(d)(1)(A)(i)(IV); *accord* Cal. Educ. Code § 56345(a)(4). IDEA also requires that the IEP set forth “the anticipated frequency, location, and duration of those services and modifications.” 20 U.S.C. § 1414(d)(1)(A)(VII); *accord* Cal. Educ. Code § 56345(a)(7).

The Court finds that Plaintiff has established a likelihood of prevailing on the merits on the issue of whether the 2015 IEP was insufficiently clear. The only reason that the ALJ found the IEP was so unclear as to constitute a procedural violation is because Plaintiff checked boxes for both individual and group speech and language therapy without clarifying “how the 45 minutes of therapy would be allotted to each.” AD ¶ 32. The Court has serious questions regarding the ALJ’s conclusion that this constitutes a procedural violation of IDEA or California law. *Union*, the case that supplied the legal standard the ALJ relied upon, found that the *complete failure to provide any written IEP at all* constitutes a complete denial of a free appropriate public education. 15 F.3d at 1523, 1526. Nothing in that case suggests that an ambiguity about how 45 minutes of therapy are allotted between individual and group constitutes a procedural violation. As the Ninth Circuit explained in *J.L. v. Mercer Island School District*, 592 F.3d 938, 952-53 (9th Cir. 2009), “[b]ecause the individualized education program is written before the provision of any services it is not reasonable to expect the school district to predict the amount of time the student will actually use the accommodations to which she has been given access.” While *Mercer Island* involved “on demand” services, that case tends to suggest that Plaintiff was not required to predict up front how 45 minutes of “as needed” therapy services would be divided between individual and group therapy services each week. *See id.* at 953. Moreover, the district court decisions from this circuit upon which the ALJ relied involved provisions substantially less specific than the ones at issue in this case and in *Mercer Island*. *See Bend LaPine v. School Dist. v. K.H.*, No. 04-1468, 2005 WL 1587241 at \*10 (D. Or. Jun. 2, 2005) (holding that the IEP behavior plan providing that specially designed instruction would be provided “throughout the school day” was too vague and indefinite to make resource commitment clear); *Marcus I. ex rel. Karen I. v. Dep’t of Educ.*, No. 10-00381, 2011 WL 1833207, at \*\*1, 7-8 (D. Haw. May 9, 2011) (holding that the IEP offer for

1 the student to attend “the public high school in [student’s] home community” was not specific  
2 enough because that description could have applied to two different high schools).

3 Furthermore, even if this ambiguity did constitute a procedural violation, the Court also  
4 has serious questions regarding the ALJ’s conclusion that the ambiguity denied D.W. a free  
5 appropriate public education. *See Mercer Island*, 592 F.3d. at 953 (“[N]ot every procedural  
6 violation results in the denial of a free appropriate public education.”). The ALJ stated two legal  
7 bases for finding this purported procedural violation constituted a denial of a free appropriate  
8 public education: (1) it significantly impeded Parents’ opportunity to participate in the IEP  
9 process; and (2) it impeded D.W.’s educational opportunities. On the record before it, the Court  
10 finds it unlikely that the ALJ could have properly found that this procedural error impeded the  
11 parents’ opportunity to participate in the IEP formulation process given the evidence of their  
12 participation in the process of formulating the IEP and the substantial detail provided in the IEP  
13 offer. Similarly, the Court finds it unlikely that the ALJ could have properly found that the 2015  
14 IEP caused D.W. the “loss of an educational opportunity” because she did not find that there was  
15 some theoretical allocation of the 45 minutes of therapy that would have deprived D.W. of his  
16 necessary special education. In other words, for the ALJ to have properly found that a procedural  
17 violation denied D.W. an educational opportunity in this context, it seems that the ALJ would  
18 have needed to find that there was some amount of group or individual speech or language therapy  
19 necessary to D.W.’s education. Instead, the ALJ found only that there was a “possibility of broad  
20 variation” in how much individual speech or language therapy D.W. would have received each  
21 week. That seems insufficient. *See id.*

22 Accordingly, the Court finds that Plaintiff has shown a likelihood of prevailing on the  
23 merits with respect to the reimbursement of the 2015-16 private tuition and transportation costs.  
24 Because the Court finds this to be the case, it need not address Plaintiff’s final argument about  
25 whether awarding full tuition and transportation costs for this purported error was inequitable.

26       2.       Irreparable Injury

27 The Court next considers whether Plaintiff has shown it is “likely to suffer irreparable  
28 harm in the absence of preliminary relief.” *Winter*, 555 U.S. at 20. The Court finds that Plaintiff

1 has made this showing. First, the CDE is currently demanding that Plaintiff comply with the  
2 COAH order on the issue of reimbursement or it will suffer sanctions up to and including losing  
3 its state educational funding. *See* Dkt. No. 12-3 ¶ 3 & Ex. A. While the Court cannot definitively  
4 conclude that the CDE will actually remove state funding from Plaintiff if it refuses to comply  
5 with the COAH order, the only evidence in the record shows that the CDE would likely sanction  
6 Plaintiff for noncompliance before this appeal is resolved. On this basis, the Court finds that  
7 harm is likely and irreparable.

8 Second, even if Plaintiff agreed to reimburse Parents pending this appeal to avoid those  
9 state sanctions, it is unlikely that Plaintiff would have any right to recoupment. The D.C. Circuit  
10 has held that “[i]t would be absurd to imagine a trial court ordering parents to reimburse a school  
11 system for the costs of a hearing examiner’s erroneous placement of their child[.]” *Jenkins v.*  
12 *Squillacote*, 935 F.2d 303, 307 n. 3 (D.C. Cir. 1991). Courts have found these kinds of “non-  
13 recoverable economic costs” to constitute irreparable harm in IDEA cases. *See Masucci*, 13 F.  
14 Supp. 3d at 41 (holding that a school district made a sufficient showing of irreparable injury to  
15 preliminary enjoin enforcement of IDEA administrative order). For this reason, the Court finds  
16 that Plaintiff has shown a likelihood of irreparable injury, even if it complies with the CDE.

17       3.     Balance of the Equities

18 The next factor that the Court considers is who the balance of the equities favors. *Winter*,  
19 555 U.S. at 20. Here, the Court finds it highly material that Parents already paid the tuition at  
20 issue to the private school over one year ago. Because this money is already a sunk cost, and no  
21 amount of money is currently due and payable to the Court’s knowledge, Parents will not incur  
22 any additional hardship if they have to wait perhaps two or three more months to receive the  
23 money if the Court affirms on appeal that they are entitled to it under IDEA and California law.  
24 Neither will D.W., who is receiving an education that is not being challenged as inadequate in this  
25 action. Accordingly, because there is only a risk that the preliminary injunction will do more good  
26 than harm, the Court finds the balance of the equities “tips sharply” in favor of Plaintiff. *See*  
27 *Alliance*, 632 F.3d at 1137-38.

28       ///

1           4.       Public Interest

2           Finally, the Court must determine whether a preliminary injunction is in the public interest.  
3           While the public has a strong interest in ensuring that all students with special needs receive the  
4           resources that are necessary for them to have an education, it is not likely that Parents are entitled  
5           to reimbursement in this case. Furthermore, Plaintiff oversees the education of many children, not  
6           just Defendant. If Plaintiff lost its state funding, that would affect many students, not just one.

7           Accordingly, the Court finds that the preliminary injunction is in the public interest.

8           5.       Summary of Findings

9           In sum, the Court has found that all factors weigh in favor of granting a temporary  
10          injunction that stays enforcement of the COAH order as to the reimbursement issue pending  
11          judicial review. Accordingly, the Court will enter a temporary injunction to that effect.

12           C.       **Federal Authority to Enforce This Order on the CDE**

13           Finally, the Court takes a moment to explain that it has the power to explicitly enjoin the  
14          CDE from enforcing the COAH order in light of this order staying enforcement pending appeal.

15           The All Writs Act provides that: “The Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of  
16          Congress may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and  
17          agreeable to the usages and principles of law.” 28 U.S.C. § 1651. “The power conferred by the  
18          Act extends, under appropriate circumstances, to persons who, though not parties to the original  
19          action or engaged in wrongdoing, are in a position to frustrate the implementation of a court order  
20          or the proper administration of justice.” *United States v. N.Y. Tel. Co.*, 434 U.S. 159, 174 (1977);  
21          *see also Retiree Support Grp. of Contra Costa Cty. v. Contra Costa Cty.*, No. 12-cv-00944, 2016  
22          WL 4080294, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Jul. 29, 2016) (noting that district courts have used the All Writs  
23          Act to address the actions of non-parties that may have an effect on ongoing federal proceedings).

24           In short, if the CDE were to continue to seek enforcement of the reimbursement part of the  
25          ALJ’s order, the Court would issue a prohibitory injunction under the All Writs Act against it.

26           IV.      **CONCLUSION**

27           For the foregoing reasons, the Court **GRANTS IN PART** and **DENIES IN PART**  
28          Plaintiff’s motion to temporarily stay enforcement of the COAH’s order. The Court does not stay

1 enforcement of the mental health evaluation but temporarily **STAYS** enforcement of the ALJ's  
2 award for reimbursement of private tuition and transportation costs for the 2015-16 school year.  
3 The temporary stay shall be in effect until the Court holds a hearing on the parties' anticipated  
4 cross-motions for summary judgment, which shall also serve as a preliminary injunction hearing.  
5 To that end, the Court advances its initial case management conference from November 1, 2016,  
6 to October 11, 2016, at 2:00pm to set an expedited briefing schedule on that motion practice. The  
7 Court finds that no security is necessary from Plaintiff to secure this temporary relief.

8 Plaintiff is **DIRECTED** to serve this order on the COAH and CDE within 24 hours and to  
9 file a status report with the Court within 24 hours of any attempt by the CDE to enforce the  
10 reimbursement component of the COAH order in any way, including by withholding state  
11 funding. If the CDE does attempt to enforce the COAH order, the Court will take appropriate  
12 action to enjoin the CDE's conduct at that time.

13  
14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: 10/4/2016

16  
17   
18 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
United States District Judge